

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

310 320 9812

P.01

JUN 17 2008

PTO/BB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2008. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**TRANSMITTAL
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

12

Application Number

09/419,752

Filing Date

10/16/1999

First Named Inventor

Peter Ar-Fu Lam

Art Unit

2626

Examiner Name

Armstrong, Angela A

Attorney Docket Number

ESY2

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

- ☐ Fee Transmittal Form
- ☐ Fee Attached
- ☒ Amendment/Reply
- ☒ After Final
- ☐ Affidavits/declaration(s)
- ☐ Extension of Time Request
- ☐ Express Abandonment Request
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement
- ☐ Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
- ☐ Reply to Missing Parts/Incomplete Application
- ☐ Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.63

- ☐ Drawing(s)
- ☐ Licensing-related Papers
- ☐ Petition
- ☐ Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
- ☐ Power of Attorney, Revocation
- ☐ Change of Correspondence Address
- ☐ Terminal Disclaimer
- ☐ Request for Refund
- ☐ CD, Number of CD(s) _____
- ☐ Landscape Table on CD

- ☐ After Allowance Communication to TC
- ☐ Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
- ☐ Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)
- ☐ Proprietary Information
- ☐ Status Letter
- ☒ Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):

11 pages of After Final response

Remarks

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name

Signature

Printed name

Peter Ar-Fu Lam

Date

06/17/08

Reg. No.

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature

Typed or printed name

Peter Ar-Fu Lam

Date

06/17/08

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

09/419,752

JUN 17 2008

Page 1 of 11

After Final Response under 37 CFR 1.116**Expedited Procedure**

Examining Group 2626

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Application of:

PETER AR-FU LAM

Serial No. 09/419,752

Filed: 10/16/99

For:
TABLE FORMAT PROGRAMMINGHon. Commissioner of Patents
and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Examiner: Armstrong, Angela A

Group: 2626

Docket: ESY2A

June 17, 2008

Dear Examiner,

This is a after final filing finance response provided under 37 CFR 1.116.**Expedited procedure is respectfully requested.**

In response to the final office action dated 04/18/2008, the applicant feels extremely great difficulty to provide a provide a proper response due to incomplete information provided in the office action. Accordingly, the examiner is respectfully requested to provide a revised non-final office action explaining:

- (1) Why the examination process did not consider as a whole ALL limitations recited in each claim as required by the MPEP? This is particularly important as each claim is supported with recited characteristics for fulfilling the compliance of 35 U.S.C. 101. The office action did NOT provide any comment to these characteristics, which clearly

09/419,752

Page 2 of 11

support each rejected claim to comply with the requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101 according to the teaching of MPEP.

- (2) Why the rejected claims, each amended according to the conclusion of previous interview between the examiner and the applicant, suppose to be adequate to comply with the requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101 are now subject to rejection under the same ground after the agreed amendment had been made?
- (3) Why the examination process was not conducted according to the requirements of MPEP, particularly related to the requirements to consider each rejected claim as a whole; and the requirement of the MPEP to clear a claim from the rejection of 35 U.S.C. 101 when practical application of useful, concrete and tangible results are identified in the recitation of each rejected claim?

Listed below is a quotation of MPEP 707.07:

"Completeness and Clarity of Examiner's Action.... The examiner's action should be complete to ALL matters...."

Listed below is a quotation of 37 C.F.R. 1.104(b) :

"Completeness of examiner's action....The examiner's action will be complete as to ALL matters....."

Since the important limitations recited in each rejected claim, supposed to meet the requirements of MPEP to comply with the requirement of 35 U.S.C. 101 had been ignored, and no comment had been provided, the office action dated 04/18/2008 is incomplete and therefore premature, so as for the applicant to provide a proper response. Withdrawal of the final status of the office action dated 04/18/2008 is respectfully requested.

The following remark repeats the facts and legal stand points well supported with MPEP presented in the previous responses. The examiner is respectfully requested to fully reconsider each fact and legal stand point presented, and explain why each FACT supported with the quoted MPEP or Guideline issued by the USPTO is not proper to overcome the ground of rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101.